

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8, 10-24, 29 and 31-33 are pending and rejected in the application. Claims 9, 25-28, 30 and 34-53 were previously cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 10, 14, 18, 23, 29 and 33 have been amended. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 14-15, 18-21, 23-24, 29 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Liu, U.S. Pat. No. 7,058,130.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103

Claims 7-8, 13, 17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of "Scene-Context Dependent Reference Frame Placement for MPEG Video Coding", (*Lan*), cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed 12 May 2004. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of "Digitale Bildcodierung" (*Ohm*), cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of 17 July 2006. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of "Video Indexing Using MPEG Motion Compensation Vectors" (*Ardizzone*). Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of van Overveld, U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0012452.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives Justin Blanton and Robert Hails in the telephonic interview conducted on August 18, 2010 and provide this Statement of the Substance of the Interview in compliance with MPEP § 713.04.

During the August 18, 2010 interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representatives discussed claim 1 in view of Liu. The Examiner indicated that if the claims were amended to clarify that the first picture may be compared to multiple subsequent pictures following the first picture in temporal order, then the Examiner would withdraw the rejections based on Liu. (Liu

Application No.: 10/743,722
Amendment dated: August 25, 2010
Reply to Office Action of May 25, 2010

currently is the basis for 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of all pending independent claims.)
Applicants believe the amended claims provide the requested clarification.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and arguments, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments which may be incurred in connection with this paper under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: August 25, 2010

/Justin Blanton/
Justin Blanton
(Registration No. 58,741)

KENYON & KENYON, LLP
333 West San Carlos Suite 600
San Jose, California 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501